

**BARSHAY SANDERS, PLLC**

100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500

Garden City, New York 11530

Tel: (516) 203-7600

Fax: (516) 706-5055

Email: *ConsumerRights@BarshaySanders.com*

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

Our File No.: 113446

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Stanley P. Sorrentino,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Allied Interstate LLC,

Defendant.

Docket No:

**COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Stanley P. Sorrentino (hereinafter referred to as “*Plaintiff*”), by and through the undersigned counsel, complains, states and alleges against Allied Interstate LLC (hereinafter referred to as “*Defendant*”), as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This action seeks to recover for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (“FDCPA”).

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This Court has federal subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d).

3. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this Judicial District.

4. At all relevant times, Defendant conducted business within the State of New York.

### **PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff Stanley P. Sorrentino is an individual who is a citizen of the State of New York residing in Nassau County, New York.

6. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

7. On information and belief, Defendant Allied Interstate LLC, is an Ohio Limited Liability Company with a principal place of business in Franklin County, Ohio.

8. Defendant is regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.

9. Defendant is a “debt collector” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

### **ALLEGATIONS**

10. Defendant alleges Plaintiff owes a debt (“the Debt”).

11. The Debt was primarily for personal, family or household purposes and is therefore a “debt” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

12. Sometime after the incurrence of the Debt, Plaintiff fell behind on payments owed.

13. Thereafter, at an exact time known only to Defendant, the Debt was assigned or otherwise transferred to Defendant for collection.

14. In its efforts to collect the debt, Defendant contacted Plaintiff by letter (“the Letter”) dated November 19, 2016. (“**Exhibit 1.**”)

15. The Letter was the initial communication Plaintiff received from Defendant.

16. The Letter is a “communication” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

### **FIRST COUNT** **Violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e**

17. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully restated herein.

18. 15 U.S.C. § 1692g provides that within five days after the initial communication with a consumer in connection with the collection of any debt, a debt collector shall, unless the information is contained in the initial communication or the consumer has paid the debt, send the consumer a written notice containing certain enumerated information.

19. 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1) requires the written notice provide “the amount of the

debt.”

20. The question of whether a written notice adequately provides “the amount of the debt” is determined from the perspective of the “least sophisticated consumer.”

21. The written notice, to comply with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1), must convey the amount of the debt clearly from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

22. The written notice, to comply with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1), must convey the amount of the debt accurately from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

23. The written notice, to comply with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1), must convey the amount of the debt without ambiguity from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

24. The written notice, to comply with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1), must allow the least sophisticated consumer to determine the minimum amount he or she owes at the time of the notice.

25. The written notice, to comply with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1), must allow the least sophisticated consumer to determine what she will need to pay to resolve the debt at any given moment in the future.

26. The written notice, to comply with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1), must contain an explanation, understandable by the least sophisticated consumer, of any fees or interest that may cause the balance to increase at any time in the future.

27. The failure to include the foregoing information renders an otherwise accurate statement of the “amount of the debt” violative of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1).

28. Even if a debt collector accurately conveys the foregoing information, the written notice nevertheless violates 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1) if the least sophisticated consumer could inaccurately interpret the message.

29. The debt was incurred on a credit card underwritten by Synchrony Bank.

30. At all relevant times herein, the debt accrued, and was subject to, interest.

31. At all relevant times herein, the debt accrued, and was subject to, late fees.

32. The Letter sets forth an “Amount Owed” of \$1,719.00.

33. The Letter states, “As of the date of this letter, the Amount Owed is \$1,719.00. Because the creditor continues to assess interest on the debt, the amount due on the day you pay may be greater.”

34. The Letter fails to indicate whether payment of the “Amount Due” by any date certain would satisfy the debt.

35. The Letter fails to provide information that would allow Plaintiff to determine what Plaintiff will need to pay to resolve the debt at any given moment in the future.

36. The Letter fails to provide information that would allow the least sophisticated consumer to determine what he or she will need to pay to resolve the debt at any given moment in the future.

37. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine what she will need to pay to resolve the debt at any given moment in the future.

38. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine the amount of his or her debt.

39. If interest is continuing to accrue, the least sophisticated consumer would not know how to satisfy the debt because the Letter fails to indicate the applicable interest rate.

40. If interest is continuing to accrue, the least sophisticated consumer would not know how to satisfy the debt because the Letter fails to indicate the date of accrual of interest.

41. If interest is continuing to accrue, the least sophisticated consumer would not know how to satisfy the debt because the Letter fails to provide the amount of interest during any measurable period.

42. If interest is continuing to accrue, the least sophisticated consumer would not know how to satisfy the debt because the Letter fails to provide any information that would enable the consumer to determine what she will need to pay to resolve the debt on any date after the date of the Letter.

43. If interest is continuing to accrue, the least sophisticated consumer would not know how to satisfy the debt because the Letter fails to provide any information that would enable the consumer to determine what she will need to pay to resolve the debt in the future.

44. The failure to include the foregoing information could lead the least sophisticated consumer to inaccurately interpret the message.

45. The failure to include the foregoing information renders the Letter’s statement of the amount of the debt, even if otherwise accurate, incomplete.

46. The failure to include the foregoing information renders the Letter’s statement of

the amount of the debt, even if otherwise accurate, insufficient.

47. For instance, the Letter fails to indicate the applicable interest rate.

48. For instance, the Letter fails to indicate the date of accrual of interest.

49. For instance, the Letter fails to indicate the amount of interest during any measurable period.

50. The Letter fails to contain an explanation, understandable by the least sophisticated consumer, of any fees and interest that may cause the amount stated to increase.

51. The Letter fails to state what part of the amount stated is attributable to principal.

52. The Letter fails to state what part of the amount stated is attributable to interest.

53. The Letter fails to state what part of the amount stated is attributable to late fees.

54. The Letter fails to state what part of the amount stated is attributable to other fees.

55. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine what she will need to pay to resolve the debt at any given moment in the future.

56. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine the amount of his or her debt.

57. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, did not convey “the amount of the debt” clearly from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

58. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, did not convey “the amount of the debt” accurately from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

59. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, did not convey “the amount of the debt” without ambiguity from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

60. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, renders the statement of the amount of the debt, even if otherwise accurate, violative of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1).

61. For these reasons, Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1).

62. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, did not adequately set forth “the amount of the debt” as required by 15 U.S.C. § 1692g.

63. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, violates 15 U.S.C. § 1692g.

**SECOND COUNT**  
**Violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e**

64. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully restated herein.

65. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs as if fully restated herein.

66. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e prohibits a debt collector from using any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.

67. While § 1692e specifically prohibits certain practices, the list is non-exhaustive, and does not preclude a claim of falsity or deception based on any non-enumerated practice.

68. The question of whether a collection letter is deceptive is determined from the perspective of the “least sophisticated consumer.”

69. A collection letter is also deceptive under 15 U.S.C. § 1692e if it is reasonably susceptible to an inaccurate reading by the least sophisticated consumer.

70. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e requires debt collectors, when they notify consumers of their account balance, to disclose whether the balance may increase due to interest and fees.

71. The amount of the debt is a material piece of information to a consumer.

72. Knowing the amount of the debt affects how a consumer responds to a debt collector’s attempts to collect the debt.

73. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine the minimum amount owed at the time of the Letter.

74. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine what she will need to pay to resolve the debt at any given moment in the future.

75. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine the amount of his or her debt.

76. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine the amount of her debt because the consumer would not know whether interest and fees would continue to accrue, or whether the amount of the debt was static.

77. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, did not convey “the amount of the debt” clearly from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

78. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, did not convey “the amount of the debt” accurately from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

79. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, did not convey “the amount of the debt” without ambiguity from the perspective of the least sophisticated consumer.

80. The Letter, because of the aforementioned failures, violates 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. *See Balke v. Alliance One Receivables Management, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-5624(ADS)(AKT), 2017 WL 2634653 (E.D.N.Y. June 19, 2017).

### **JURY DEMAND**

81. Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of this action by jury.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment as follows:

- a. Damages against Defendant pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k; and
- b. Plaintiff's attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k; and
- c. Plaintiff's costs; all together with
- d. Such other relief that the Court determines is just and proper.

DATED: November 20, 2017

### **BARSHAY SANDERS, PLLC**

By: /s/ Craig B. Sanders  
Craig B. Sanders, Esq.  
100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500  
Garden City, New York 11530  
Tel: (516) 203-7600  
Fax: (516) 706-5055  
csanders@barshaysanders.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
Our File No.: 113446